

A Comment on the Entropy of Strongly Coupled $\mathcal{N} = 4$

N. Itzhaki

Department of Physics
University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106
sunny@physics.ucsb.edu

Abstract

We propose a field theory argument, which rests on the non-renormalization of the two point function of the energy-momentum tensor, why the ratio between the entropies of strongly coupled and weakly coupled $\mathcal{N} = 4$ is of order one.

The Maldacena conjecture [1] and the entropy of near-extremal D3-branes [2] imply that the ratio between the entropies, at fixed temperature, of strongly coupled and weakly coupled $\mathcal{N} = 4$ is $3/4$. In $\mathcal{N} = 4$, unlike 2D CFT, the entropy is not protected thus it is not surprising that the ratio is not 1. It is surprising, however, that the ratio is not a function of the 't Hooft coupling, $\lambda = g_{YM}^2 N$, which vanishes when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

The reason is the following *perturbative* argument.¹ At finite temperature, T , the expectation value of the fields is $\langle \phi^2 \rangle = T^2$. As a result the potential term in SYM, which has the form $V \sim g_{YM}^2 [\phi_i, \phi_j]^2$, induces a mass, $m^2 \sim \lambda T^2$, for a generic field. At small 't Hooft coupling the induced masses are much smaller than the temperature so to a good approximation the contribution to the entropy is of N^2 massless fields with a small correction which reduces the entropy.² At large 't Hooft coupling the induced masses are much larger than the temperature. Therefore, the contribution to the entropy from a generic field (not in the Cartan subalgebra of $SU(N)$) is suppressed at the strongly coupled region.

Since the argument above rests on perturbation theory it cannot be trusted all the way to the strongly coupled region and hence, strictly speaking, there is no contradiction with the Maldacena conjecture. Still, it is fair to say that it is somewhat disturbing that

¹Though this argument is widely known we did not find it in the literature. A closely related discussion can be found in [3, 4].

²For a rigorous discussion on the weakly coupled region see [5].

the only field theory argument available (as far as we know) leads to that conclusion. Especially, when a similar argument for SYM in $1 + 1$ dimensions [3, 4] leads to results that fit so nicely into the Maldacena conjecture for D1-branes [6, 7, 8].

The purpose of this short note is to put forward a *field theory* argument, which does not rest on the AdS/CFT correspondence, that implies that the entropy at large coupling is of the order of the entropy at weak coupling. The argument rests on the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ non-renormalization theorem for the energy-momentum tensor two point function and therefore it cannot be generalised to two dimensional SYM which is a non-conformal theory and hence the R-symmetry cannot protect the two-point function.

We study SYM in a box whose volume is $L_z A$ with $A = L_x L_y$ and we take the limit $L_x, L_y \gg L_z$. Consider the transformation $x_3 \rightarrow x_3(1 - \varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon \ll 1$. The variation of the action under this transformation is

$$\delta S = \varepsilon \int d^3x \int_0^{L_z} dx_3 T_{33}. \quad (1)$$

Therefore, the variation of the expectation value of T_{00} is

$$\delta \langle T_{00}(0) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\phi (e^{-(S+\delta S)} - e^{-S}) T_{00}(0) = \varepsilon \int d^3x \int_0^{L_z} dx_3 \langle T_{00}(0) T_{33}(x) \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{D}\phi$ represents integration with respect to all fields. To calculate the integral we need to know the energy-momentum tensor two point function. On R^4 non-renormalization theorem protects the energy-momentum tensor two point function. Thus on R^4 we can use the free SYM result

$$\langle T(0) T(x) \rangle = \frac{N^2}{x^8}, \quad (3)$$

where we have suppressed numerical factors of order one and the Lorentz indices (for details see [9]).

However, what we need is not the two-point function in R^4 but rather in $R^3 \times S^1$. In two dimensions the conformal transformation group contains the transformation from R^2 to $R \times S^1$. Therefore, the two-points function in $R \times S^1$ are determined by the two-points function in R^2 and the dimensions of the operators. This is an important ingredient in Cardy's proof that the asymptotic growth of the number of state of a 2D CFT depends only on the central charge and not on the details of the CFT [10, 11]. In four dimensions, however, the conformal transformations do not contain the transformation from R^4 to $R^3 \times S^1$. Thus, we do not know the exact form of the energy-momentum two point function for strongly coupled SYM on $R^3 \times S^1$.³

³For weakly coupled theories one can find directly on $R^3 \times S^1$ the mode expansion of the relevant fields. So there is no need to start with the two-points function on R^4 .

What we do know is that at distances smaller than L_z the boundary condition is irrelevant and so eq.(3) is a good approximation at short distances. Therefore, for a given point on S^1 we can calculate the contribution to $\delta\langle T_{00}(x_3)\rangle$ from the region $|x_3 - x'_3| < L_z$. The integral diverges at short distances. The regularized result is $\delta\langle T_{00}(0)\rangle \sim \frac{\varepsilon N^2}{L_z^4}$. Integrating over the volume we find the variation of the ground state energy, which yields after integration with respect to $\delta L_z = \varepsilon L_z$, the ground state energy

$$E_0 \sim \frac{N^2 A}{L_z^3}. \quad (4)$$

It is important to emphasize that we have assumed in the calculation of $\delta\langle T_{00}\rangle$ that the integration over the whole region does not contain cancellations between the region where eq.(3) is a good approximation and the region where it is not. Such cancellations can, in principle, reduce the ground state energy in a significant way to yield E_0 which is suppressed at large coupling. Therefore, our argument is not a proof but rather a strong indication that the entropies ratio is of order one. In other words, we estimate the Casimir energy, which is a boundary condition effect, using an approximation which is not sensitive to the details of the boundary condition but only to the distance between the boundaries.

Eq.(4) implies that the partition function at low temperature (compared to L_z) is,

$$Z \sim \exp\left(\frac{N^2 A \beta}{L_z^3}\right). \quad (5)$$

Now we can use the standard argument of switching the roles of β and L_z ⁴ to end up with the partition function of strongly coupled SYM at high temperature (compared to the size of the box)

$$Z \sim \exp(N^2 V T^3), \quad (6)$$

which agrees, up to a numerical factor in the exponent, with the partition function of weakly coupled SYM.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Aki Hashimoto for helpful discussions. Work supported in part by the NSF grant PHY97-22022.

References

- [1] J.M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231, hep-th/9711200.

⁴See [12] for a related discussion in the context of the AdS/CFT correspondence.

- [2] S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov and A.W. Peet, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 3915, hep-th/9602135.
- [3] J.A. Harvey, G. Moore and A. Strominger, Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995) 7161, hep-th/9501022.
- [4] M. Bershadsky, A. Johansen, V. Sadov and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. **B448** (1995) 166, hep-th/9501096.
- [5] A. Fotopoulos and T.R. Taylor, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 061701, hep-th/9811224
- [6] N. Itzhaki, J.M. Maldacena, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1998) 046004, hep-th/9802042.
- [7] A.W. Peet and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 065006, hep-th/9809022.
- [8] A. Hashimoto and N. Itzhaki, hep-th/9903067.
- [9] D. Anselmi, D.Z. Freedman, M.T. Grisaru and A.A. Johansen, Phys. Lett. **B394** (1997) 329.
- [10] J.L. Cardy, Nucl. Phys. **B270** (1986) 186.
- [11] H.W.J. Bloete, J.L. Cardy and M.P. Nightingale, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 742.
- [12] G.T. Horowitz and R.C. Myers, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 026005, hep-th/9808079.